

Exhibit 3

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP

10 NORTH PEARL STREET • 4TH FLOOR • ALBANY, NY 12207 • PH. 518.434.0600 • FAX 518.434.0665

July 17, 2012

VIA E-MAIL AND FIRST CLASS MAIL

Eva W. Cole
Molly M. Donovan
Winston & Strawn LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166-4193

Re: *In re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation*, Master File No. 3:07-cv-05944-SC (N.D. Cal.)

Dear Eva and Molly:

On behalf of the Direct Action Plaintiffs (“DAPs”) in the above-referenced litigation, I write concerning the operative complaints in the DAP actions (“Complaints”).¹ You have asked whether the DAPs’ Complaints include claims alleging that Defendants have combined and conspired to fix, raise, maintain or stabilize the prices of certain products containing CRTs (“CRT Finished Products”) (said claims herein referred to as the “CRT Finished Products Conspiracy Claims”). This letter will confirm that the DAPs are not asserting any CRT Finished Products Conspiracy Claims in their current Complaints.


The DAPs are asserting claims that Defendants have combined and conspired to fix, raise, maintain or stabilize the prices of CRTs, which conspiracy had a foreseen and intended effect on the price of CRT Finished Products and thus injured purchasers of CRT Finished Products. The DAPs purchased CRT Finished Products containing allegedly price-fixed CRTs

¹ The DAP actions are: *Electrograph Systems, Inc., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.*, 11-cv-01656 (SC) (N.D. Cal.); *Stoebner, et al. v. LG Electronics, et al.*, No. 11-cv-05381 (SC) (N.D. Cal.); *Siegel v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.*, No. 11-cv-05502 (SC) (N.D. Cal.); *Best Buy Co., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.*, No. 11-cv-05513 (SC) (N.D. Cal.); *Target Corp., et al. v. Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd.*, No. 11-cv-05514 (SC) (N.D. Cal.); *Interbond Corporation of America v. Hitachi, et al.*, No. 11-cv-06275 (SC) (N.D. Cal.); *Office Depot, Inc. v. Hitachi Ltd., et al.*, 11-cv-06276 (SC) (N.D. Cal.); *Compucom Systems, Inc. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.*, No. 11-cv-06396 (SC) (N.D. Cal.); *Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.*, No. 11-cv-06397 (SC) (N.D. Cal.); *P.C. Richard and Son Long Island Corp., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.*, 12-cv-02648 (SC) (N.D. Cal.); and *Schultze Agency Services, LLC, et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.*, 12-cv-02649 (SC) (N.D. Cal.).

July 17, 2012
Eva W. Cole
Molly M. Donovan
Page 2 of 2

from Defendants and their co-conspirators and the controlled subsidiaries and affiliates of Defendants and co-conspirators, as well as from other suppliers. Thus, the issue of the impact or effect of the alleged price fixing of CRTs on the prices of CRT Finished Products remains in the case, and is a proper subject of discovery.

Sincerely,



Philip J. Iovienco